A Return to ſome Expreſsions publiſhed in a Sermon preached by Mr. JOHN SIMPSON At ALHALLOWS: From *Heb.* cap.4. upon the 30th day of the ninth Moneth, 1656.

Whereby

He indeavored to prove that the ſeventh day Sabbath, as in the fourth Precept of the Moral Law, is aboliſhed by Chriſt, he being that Reſt which Believers enter into by Faith.

Preſented

To the Serious conſideration of all ſuch as own *Jehovah* to be their God, King, and Law-giver; as in *Iſ.*33.21. compared with *Jam.*2.8. and 4.12. and particularly to ſuch of them as heard Mr. *Simpſon* preach at the time and place aforementioned,

By *John Spittlehouſe.*

Chriſtian Brethren and Friends,

THe Lord having through his free Grace and Mercy, brought me over to the knowledge and obedience of that Precept in the *Royal Law* of *Jehovah*, which hath been obſcured and almoſt quite obliterated by the man of ſin, and his adherents, 2 *Theſ.* c.12. (during the grand apoſtacy of the whore of *Rome*) who as foretold, hath changed the Truths of God into a lie, through their cunning deceiveableneſs; whereby they have changed Times and Laws, *Dan.*7.25. And having obtained ſuch a mercy from the Lord;

I did (as I conceived was my duty) indeavor to ſtrengthen ſuch of my Friends, as were in the practice thereof before me, as alſo to inform others in the Truth thereof. Whereupon, according to the talent given me from above, I with ſome others, publiſhed a Book intituled, *A Vindication of the unchangeable Morality of the ſeventh day Sabbath*, &c. Againſt which Book there hath been much threatning by ſome to anſwer it in writing, but as yet I have not ſeen any thing to ſuch purpoſe: Onely of late I underſtood, that Mr. *John Simpſon* preſented himſelf at *Alhallows*, to oppoſe the practice of ſuch as make conſcience to keep the ſeventh day Sabbath, according to the Commandment, *Exod.*20. 8 9,10,11. upon the account that Jeſus Chriſt is the Reſt unto Believers, and that the ſeventh Day Sabbath, mentioned in the fourth Precept of the ten Commandments, was but a Typical Sabbath, and is ſwallowed up in the Reſt which Believers have in Chriſt.

Whereupon I reſolved to hear what he could ſay, as to the proof thereof; and being at *Alhallows* at the aforementioned time, I heard him raiſe this Obſervation, from *Heb.* 4.3 *&c.* That it was the Apoſtles intention in that Chapter, to draw Believers off from the Obſervation of the Jewiſh Sabbath, as in the fourth Precept of the ten Words or Commandments, upon the aforeſaid account.

But coming to anſwer this Objection, made by the Obſervators of the ſeventh Day Sabbath, as in the fourth Precept, *viz. That the fourth Precept, which commands the obſervation of the Sabbath in queſtion, is part of that Law which Jeſus Chriſt came not to deſtroy, but contrarywiſe hath ratified in every jot and tittle thereof unto the end of the world, and that therefore the ſaid Sabbath, ſo commanded, was not changed or altered in any jot or tittle thereof, but contrarywiſe in as full force as any of the other Precepts in the ſaid Law*: He thereupon expounded the Law, there ſpoken of, *Mat.*5,17,18,19. to be meant of the five Books of *Moſes*, and all the Laws therein contained *viz.* The *Moral Law*, the *Judicial Law*, and the Ceremonial Law: and thence concluded,

1. That Jeſus Chriſt came not to deſtroy the *Moral Law*, but to fulfil it; and therefore whatſoever is Moral in the ten Commandments, is to be continued until the ſecond coming of Chriſt; and that Chriſtians are bound to the obſervation thereof, until then.

2. That to obſerve *one day in ſeven*, for a Sabbath, is Moral; but not the ſeventh Day Sabbath, as injoyned in the fourth Precept

cept of the ten Words or Commandments: and withal denied that every thing that is contained in the ten Commandments is Moral.

And for proof thereof, he inſtanced in theſe two following particulars, in the ſaid Law. The firſt of which was from the ſecond Precept, in theſe words, *Viſiting the iniquities of the fathers upon their children to the third and fourth generation.* The ſecond inſtance was from the fifth Precept, in theſe words, *That thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.*

From the firſt of theſe Inſtances he urged, That them words did not concern us, for that the Lord would not now viſit the iniquities of Fathers, Grand-fathers, or great Grand-fathers, upon their poſterity for their offences; and therefore not Moral.

And from the ſecond inſtance, he alſo urged, That thoſe expreſſions tended onely to the Jews in the land of *Canaan*, and do not concern us; and therefore not Moral.

Now in reply to all theſe forementioned particulars of Mr. *Simpſons Confeſſions* and *Denials*; I ſhall in the firſt place begin with the two Inſtances laſt mentioned, which he ſaith are not Moral.

To which I anſwer, That by the like Argument he might have urged, that none of the ten Commandments, neither the Law-giver himſelf, doth appertain unto us; for in the Preface to that Law, the Lord ſtileth himſelf the Iſraelites God, and gave *them* the ſaid Commandments upon that account that he brought them out of the land of *Egypt*, and from the houſe of bondage.

But are the Gentiles Saints therefore to conclude (as ſome of them wickedly do from *Pſal.*147.19,20) That the ten Commandments appertain not unto them, as a rule of right living both towards God and our Neighbor, notwithſtanding they were ſo given unto the Jews? *God forbid.* And if ſo, then how dare the opponent ſay, that his two Inſtances are not Moral, and ſo do not concern us, as much as any other Reaſons in the ſaid Law, to induce us to the obedience thereof, they bring no other?

Again as touching the firſt Inſtance, I fear the opponent did fallaciouſly leave out theſe words — *of them that hate me*, which he did not mention; the Law-giver onely intending ſuch children as walk in the ſteps of their wicked parents, as in *Ezek.*18. where the Prophet avoucheth that God will do ſo to ſuch children: For if the Law-giver be *unchangeable*, then doubtleſs ſuch muſt be his judgements, relating to his Law. But the Law-maker is unchangeable, *Mal.*3.6. therefore his judgements for the violation of his Laws, and

that all the world are lyable to the judgements of God, for the violation of his royal Law, *vid. Rom.* 3.19. and consequently all generations, whether past, present, or to come; and if so, then the present generation, in which we live, and that in any part of the earth.

Again, why may not God as well now visit the iniquities of Fathers upon their wicked children, to the third or fourth generation, as shew mercy to the Godly children of Godly Parents, to a thousand generations? and if this comparison will hold, then the said instance is as Moral as any other Reason, to induce us to be obedient to that Law.

And as to the second Instance, he might as well have said, that we are not now obliged to *honour our parents*, because we have not our abode in the land of *Canaan*; as if the promise of God did not as well extend to give the blessing of a long life to any, for honouring their parents, unless they lived in the land of *Canaan*: when as the Apostle affirmeth, that it shall extend to all Believers upon the face of the earth, *Ephe.* 6.2,3.

Again, is a punishment to be inflicted for disobedience to parents; and yet the blessing not to extend to such as honor them? surely it is absurd so to argue.

And thus I hope I have removed the aspersions cast upon the *royal Law* of Jehovah, by the apparent urging the said Instances not to be Moral and Perpetual, and so to blast the Precepts thereby.

I shall in the next place enter upon his *acknowledgements* aforementioned. And from the first of them, I appeal to all rational men, whether Mr. *Simpson* hath not thereby clearly granted, that the old and faulty Covenant delivered in *Sinai*, and written in Tables of Stone, is not so faulty or done away, as that Christians are set at liberty by Christ, to violate any part thereof, but contrarywise obliged to the observation thereof.

And from the second part of his acknowledgement, I appeal as aforesaid, whether he hath not also thereby granted, that the observation of *all days*, are not taken away by the death of Christ, but that there is yet *one day in seven*, that is to be observed in a special manner, for a Sabbath by Christians; and therefore hath clearly given himself the lie, from what he urged, from *Gal.* 4.10,11. *viz.* That if the Apostle had known of any day which ought to have been observed by Christians under the Gospel, he would have then excepted it; but that, in as much as he there excepted no day, there was none to be observed by Christians.

But

But it seems the Apostle *Paul* knew not so much as the opponent, for otherwise he would have excepted *one day in seven*, to have been observed for a Sabbath by Christians, and that until the second coming of Christ to judgement: so that this confession from his own mouth, doth clearly manifest, that the twelve Arguments which he hath, and doth intend to extract from the Scriptures to prove a non-observance of a day by Christians for a Sabbath, in regard that Jesus Christ is their Rest, will prove no better then *twelve palpable falshoods*, fathered upon the Lord Jesus and hi Apostles, being urged to prove what the opponent himself acknowledgeth they never intended in any of their words or writings; for had they so done, how could it be, that one day of seven, is yet in force as a Sabbath, which the opponent doth freely acknowledge; yea, that it ought to be observed by Christians until the second coming of Christ.

Again I appeal as aforesaid, whether by this acknowledgement he hath not also granted, that all Sanctity or Holiness is not taken away from all Days, by Christ; for if one day in every seven is to be morally observed for a Sabbath, and that by vertue of the fourth Precept of the Moral Law, then the said observation must necessarily agree with the terms expressed in the said Law, according to the intent of the Law-maker, *viz.*

1. It must be Celebrated as a Day blessed and sanctified by God.
2. It must be observed in commemoration that Jehovah made the World in six days, and rested the seventh Day.
3. In commemoration of our Sanctification by God and Christ, (God sanctifying by Christ) *Exod.*31.13.
4. By fitting our selves for such a duty, by a cessation fron *bodily labour*, as also our children, servants, and cattel.
5. By observing it as Gods Holi-day, a Delight, the Holy of the Lord, Honorable; and therein honor our God, by forsaking our own pleasures, and not doing our own ways, nor speaking our own words, *Isa.*58.13,14.

And if so, then the Opponent hath herein also given himself the lie, by then avouching both from himself and others, that every day ought to be kept as a sabbath by Christians; whereas God hath permitted man to labor, and do what he hath to do, six days in every week, or seven days: The Apostle *Paul* also injoyneth Christians to labour; which if they do, as also their family and cattel, it is impossible to keep every day a sabbath, as God hath commanded it to be kept.

And which if they do not, they cannot keep them as Sabbaths. But men cannot both reſt from labor, and work at the ſame time; therefore impoſſible to keep an every day ſabbath, if perſons follow their callings in the world. But if I be not miſtaken, that which the Opponent aimeth at, in the nulling of the ſeventh day ſabbath in queſtion, is, that Chriſtians ought not now to imitate the Jewiſh Rites and Ceremonies which were uſed on that day, as offering up two Lambs in the morning, and two Lambs in the evening, of every ſeventh day ſabbath. And if the conteſt lie in this, we clearly agree with him; for we do neither in judgement or practice, own any ſuch thing; neither doth the Commandment that injoyneth the ſeventh day ſabbath, require any ſuch duty of us; True indeed, the Law of the Prieſthood did require as aforeſaid; but we know that Law to be done away, *Heb.*7.12. and conſequently ſuch duties are not now required of Chriſtian Gentiles, *Acts* 15.10 28,29.

Again, by the ſame Argument, that the obſervation of the ſeventh day Sabbath ſhould now ceaſe, becauſe of the legal oblations that were offered thereon, the very obſervation of all other Days, and Weeks, and Moneths, and Years, are alſo to be nulled, (and which all Chriſtians now allow of) for there were Oblations offered in every of them; it was not then the bare obſervation of Days, or Weeks, or Moneths, or Years, that the Apoſtle driveth at, *Gal.*4. 10,11. but the ſmokes of Jewiſh Sacrifices, *&c.* which were offered thereon: which we diſclaim both in judgement and practice, as much as Mr. *Simpſon* can do.

And thus you ſee what hath befaln the Orator from his own confeſſion, and that which he could not avoid, unleſs he had wholly obliterated the fourth Precept in every particular thereof; for if he had denied any Day of ſeven to have been Moral, as he doth the ſeventh Day now in queſtion, he had thereby blotted out the whole Precept, and ſo have made but nine Commandments, whereas the Holy Ghoſt ſaith there are ten, as alſo the Opponent himſelf; ſo that we are not much beholden to him for ſuch acknowledgement, ſeeing he knew not how to avoid it; and conſequently, none ought to think that he was ſurpriſed therein, as to confeſs he knew not what.

Having thus prepared my way, I ſhall in the next place reply to that which he denieth to be Moral in the fourth Precept, which is the onely thing now to be handled: namely, that the ſeventh Day Sabbath, mentioned in the fourth Precept of the Decalogue, was a typical Ceremony, and ſo aboliſhed by Chriſt, he being the true

Reſt

Reſt, which Believers do enter into by faith, *Heb.*4.3. to which I return this Reply.

If the Sabbath be abrogated by Jeſus Chriſt to all Believers, then it was abrogated to *Moſes* and the Prophets, that did ſucceed him, who all wrote of Chriſt, and that by the acknowledgement of Chriſt himſelf, *Luk.*24.25,26,27. which they could not have done, had they not believed on him; and therefore by the ſame Argument that perſons do now enter into Reſt in Chriſt by faith, they did ſo then. But did ſuch their Reſt in Chriſt by faith, induce them not to obſerve the Sabbath in queſtion? ſurely none that are in their right minde will aver it, ſeeing the Prophet *Eſay* ſo highly extolleth it, as hath been ſhewed. But the Opponent may ſay, This was before the Paſſion of Chriſt: to which I anſwer;

Was not the Lord Jeſus a Lamb ſlain from the foundation of the world? and if ſo, then was his not blood as efficatious before his Paſſion upon earth, as ſince his blood was actually ſhed? Again, I preſume the Opponent cannot with modeſty deny that *Joſeph* of *Arimathea*, and the women mentioned, *Luk.*23.54. *&c.* believed in Chriſt; and if ſo, then it clearly appeareth that they Celebrated the ſeventh Day Sabbath, according to the Commandment, *Ver.* 55, 56, *viz.* the ſeventh Day from the Creation; which the Opponent affirmeth ought not to be obſerved by Believers under the Goſpel. But to this he may alſo reply, That Chriſt was not yet riſen and aſcended, and ſo no good proof.

To which I anſwer, It is evident that the Apoſtles of the Lord Jeſus, did Celebrate the ſeventh Day Sabbath after the Reſurrection and Aſcention of Chriſt, as clearly appeareth by the practice of the Apoſtle *Paul*, *Acts* 13.14,42,44. and 17.2. and 18.4. in which Scriptures it is alſo manifeſt, That the people did uſually aſſemble together upon that Day. And ſurely the Apoſtle *Paul* was one that believed in Chriſt. But the Opponent may yet ſay, that the Apoſtle did not this in obedience to the Sabbath in queſtion.

My anſwer is, there being no change made of the Sabbath in queſtion, it muſt needs be in obedience thereunto. And that there was no change made thereof, will thus appear: For if any change thereof were made, it muſt be by Jeſus Chriſt, that Great Prophet, which *Moſes* foretold ſhould be ſent to the people of God, to direct them *according to all* that the Lord had done in *Horeb*, when he gave them the ten Commandments, or elſe by his Apoſtles in the New Teſtament; but neither this Great Prophet nor his Apoſtles, did

ever

ever change the Sabbath in queſtion, either by their Precepts or Practice. And ſeeing there was no new Precept given, but contrarywiſe the old one ratified and eſtabliſhed by them, *Mat.*5.17,18, 19. & *Rom.*3.29,30,31. and that both to Jew and Gentile believers (as in the laſt text) there could no change thereof be made in precept by them; but contrarywiſe the old Precept ratified and eſtabliſhed.

But the Opponent may ſay (as ſome ſimply do) that the fourth Precept is not mentioned in either of the aforeſaid Texts; and therefore not intended by them.

To which I anſwer, The Particulars are ever included in the General, the parts in the whole, as all rational men very well know; and therefore where the general is mentioned without any exception, there all the particulars are included.

But in the ſecond forementioned Text, the general is mentioned without any exceptions, therefore all the particulars of that Law there ſpoken of by them are included, and conſequently in full force both to Jew and Gentile believers in every jot and tittle thereof.

Again, that the Law there mentioned by them, did not include the five Books of *Moſes*, will appear, firſt, in that the great Prophet himſelf, to let them know what Law he there intended, did immediately fall upon the expoſition of the Moral Law, and the Statutes and Judgements appertaining thereunto, but doth not in the leaſt mention the Law of the Prieſthood; therefore it was not there intended by him.

Again, where ever his Apoſtles ſpeak of the Law, which the Lord Jeſus Chriſt ſo preached up as part of the doctrine of the Goſpel of his Kingdom, *Mat.*4.23. compared with *cap.*5. they ever expound it to be meant of the ten Commandments, *Rom.*13.8 9 10. and the Apoſtle *James* ſtileth it the *Royal Law*, cap.2.8.*&c.* alluding to what the great Prophet had declared it to be, *viz.* the Law of his Kingdom, Faith and Love, being the two grand ingredients of Chriſts kingdom of Grace, *Gal.*5.17. and Love is the fulfilling of the *Law Royal*, *Jam.*2.8.&c. 1 *Joh.*2.1 2,3 4. and 3.3 4. and 5.1,2.3. and hence the Apoſtle *Paul* magnifieth this Royal Law to be Holy, Juſt, and Good, *Rom.*7.12. and that the faith of the Goſpel doth not deſtroy this Law, *Rom.* 3.29 30.31, either to Jew or Gentile believers: yea, the Apoſtle *James* confirmeth the Practice thereof amongſt them, and that, to the leaſt point thereof, *Jam.*2.8, 9,10,11,*&c.* and that the ſtatutes appertaining to the ſaid Law, are

of

of *a like* binding nature to all Believers under the Gospel *vida Tim.* 1.8 9,10 11. and consequently the Opponent was grosly mistaken, in affirming that by Law, *Mat.*5.17,18,19. Christ intended the five Books of *Moses*, and all the Laws contained therein; and that the Judicial Law was abolished by Christ: whereas the Apostle doth affirm it is in force, were there Magistrates, as at the first, to put them in execution according to *Rom.*13. which is now the great expectation of the Saints of the most high, to see accomplished; so that the Judicial Law, appertaining to the Moral Law, is no more nihilated, then the Sun is under a cloud, or the Gospel-Ordinances under the Antichristian state; it being more possible for Heaven and Earth to pass away, then one jot or tittle of these Laws, *Luk.*16,17 18, *&c.* yea, the great Prophet was so far from nulling of those Laws of his Kingdom, as that he professeth that whosoever shall either *do* or *teach* contrary thereunto, shall be esteemed the *least* therein: which the Opponent may take notice of; for the word, *whosoever*, Mat.5.19. will reach him one day to purpose, without repentance, as also all others that sleight the least jot or tittle thereof, and consequently the Sabbath in question. But above all, I stand in *admiration* at such as acknowledge the *Statutes* and *Judgements*, derived from the Moral Law, to be of a binding Nature unto all Nations, and yet esteem it a thing of no weight, to violate *that Law* from whence those Statutes and Judgements are derived; So that their sin is much greater then those that sleight the Royal Law, as a thing old and faulty, and consequently freed from their obedience thereunto; which thing the Apostles never intended, as hath been shewed, but the contrary. And therefore that which God and Christ, and his Apostles, hath so joyned together, *viz. Faith* and *Works*, let no man dare henceforth to put a sunder, so that justification be not expected by working; which thing we detest.

Doubtless they cannot be meet persons to set up the laws which they themselves reject.

From all which it may be safely concluded, That neither God nor Christ, nor his Apostles, did ever intend to null the Royal Law in point of *obedience*, or the statutes and judgements appertaining thereunto, and consequently not the fourth Precept in the Royal Law of Christ, and thereby the Sabbath in question; and therefore yet in force to all Believers.

But the Opponent may say, though there were not a change of the Sabbath by Precept, yet there was by Practice, in that the Apostle *Paul* did both preach and administer the Sacrament of breaking of Bread at *Troas*, upon the first day of the week. B To

To this I reply (beſides that which I gave in anſwer thereunto, in my Book aforementioned) That the actions of men, yea albeit *of holy men*, cannot alter or change the Commandments of God: nay not the bare actions of the Apoſtles themſelves; for if ſo, then *Peter*, *James*, and *Paul*, eſtabliſheth that which Chriſt came to take away, ſeeing they both countenanced and practiced *Ceremonies*, after the Reſurrection and Aſcention of Chriſt, *Act.* 21.20, *&c.* And it cannot be proved in all the New Teſtament, that either Jeſus Chriſt or his Apoſtles, did ever reſtrain preaching upon the Sabbath in queſtion; yea, Chriſt himſelf was ſo far from obſerving the firſt day of the weak, for a *Sabbath of Reſt*, that himſelf and two of his Diſciples travelled above fifteen miles, upon the day he roſe from the grave; *Luk.* 24.

And as touching that inſtance of *Paul* at *Troas*, I anſwer, That preaching and adminiſtring the Sacraments, are not unerring marks of a Sabbath: For the Apoſtle exhorteth *Timothy* to preach in ſeaſon, and out of ſeaſon, 2 *Tim.* 4.2. And Chriſt adminiſtred his Supper upon a *Thurſday* night, before he was crucified; and *Philip* baptized the Eunuch upon a travelling day, *Act.* 8. 18. Chriſt alſo preached to the *Samaritans* upon a week-day, or work-day; for his Diſciples were gone to the city to buy Bread, *Joh.* 4. 8. and the Apoſtles taught daily in the Temple, and brake Bread from houſe to houſe; *Act.* 5.46. And therefore ſeeing the duties of preaching and adminiſtring the Sacraments, are not ſo proper to the Sabbath, as that they may not be uſed on any day elſe: how can theſe duties be ſuch marks of the Sabbath?

Again, if *Pauls* preaching and breaking of Bread at *Troas* be exemplary and binding, then all ſuch as are Miniſters of the Goſpel, are bound to preach every firſt day of the week until midnight, and then break Bread after that; and conſequently, the Opponent himſelf, or elſe he is not a follower of *Paul*.

Again, ſuch Objectors are to prove that *Paul* begun his Speech at the uſual time of aſſembling upon the Sabbath day, and that in conſcience to the fourth Commandment, or they ſay nothing more then to beg the queſtion, *viz.* that the firſt day of the week is the Sabbath: which is denied them.

Again, where doth it appear, that either *Peter* or *Paul*, or any other of the Apoſtles preached two firſt days, immediately and ſucceſſively one following the other? and if not, then where is the conſtancy of the Apoſtles keeping the firſt day of the week for a Sab-

bath

bath day? And *a ſingle action is no practice.* Whereas on the contrary it is clear, That *Paul* preached conſtantly upon the Sabbath day, *Act.*13.14 42,44. and that both to the Jews and Gentiles: and 16.13. and 17.2. where it is ſaid, *And Paul as his cuſtom was went in unto them, and three ſabbath days reaſoned with them out of the Scriptures.*

And therefore ſeeing there can be no proofs found in Scripture, that either Chriſt or his Apoſtles changed the Sabbath, either by Precept or Practice: I hope all who deſire to ſee the Laws and Ordinances of the Lord Jeſus put in practice, will henceforth bid farewell to the Antichriſtian traditions of men, ſince the Apoſtles; and conſequently, that beadrol of perſons, which the Opponent urged to prove the firſt day of the week to be the Chriſtian Sabbath; and that from the Opponents own doctrine then delivered; where ſhewing the dignity of the Scriptures, he exhorted his then Auditory, not to believe any whoſoever, that did not prove their aſſertions by the ſacred Scripture.

But he will tell me he hath produced a Scripture to prove that the Sabbath in queſtion was a type of our Reſt in Chriſt; and therefore the true reſt being come, the ſhadow is to be done way: To which I ſhall adde this further anſwer (to what hath been already ſaid hereunto) that it plainly appeareth by the Opponents own confeſſion, that the ſhadow is not ſo done away, as that it hath no being as to Practice; ſeeing that he hath acknowledged one day in ſeven is to be obſerved for a Sabbath of reſt, until the ſecond coming of Chriſt.

Again, it is evident, That thoſe words of the Apoſtle, *Heb.*4. are onely a parallel betwixt the conduct of *Iſrael* into the land of *Canaan*, by *Moſes* and *Joſhua*, and the conduct of Chriſtians into the ſpiritual *Canaan*, by Jeſus Chriſt (as is proved in my former Book aforementioned) *viz.* that new Jeruſalem, which is from above, that heavenly city, which all the Holy men of God aimed at, and the promiſes appertaining thereunto, *Rev.*21,& 22. which promiſes they did not receive whilſt they were in their earthly pilgrimage, but onely ſaw them afar off by faith, by which they were perſwaded of them, and imbraced them, confeſſing they were ſtrangers and pilgrims on the earth, *Heb.*11.13. and conſequently not the Oppenent himſelf, for all his boaſting to what he hath attained; for albeit Believers in Chriſt are ſaid to come *unto* thoſe attainments, *Heb.*12,22,23,24. yet are they not ſaid to have made an entrance *into them.*

Again, the Apoſtle further ſheweth, *Heb.*11.*ult.* that all the worthies of old *died, not having received the promiſes*; yea, that they ſhall not be perfected without us, *viz.* until the fulneſs of the Gentiles ſhall be brought in, as in *Rom.*11.25,26,27. compared with *Rev* 7. which I preſume the opponent himſelf will not ſay is yet accompliſhed: and if ſo, then put the caſe that the ſeventh day Sabbath were a type of that ſpiritual in Chriſt, yet it is to be continued until that time.

Again, *Heb.*4.3. ſaith onely, that we which have believed *do enter into reſt*; but *ver.*10. ſaith, that he that *is entred into his reſt*, hath alſo *ceaſed from his own works, as God did from his*; implying, that the entrance that is made in this life, is onely by faith (as hath been ſhewed) but the *real entrance* is not until this earthly tabernacle be diſſolved: and hence the Spirit ſaith, Bleſſed are they that die in the Lord, for they *reſt from their labors*, and their works follow them, *Rev.*14.13. *viz.* ſuch as have *kept the commandments of God*, and the *faith of Jeſus*, ver.12. implying, that ſuch as joyn not *obedience* to *every command of God*, to their *faith in Jeſus* whilſt they *live*, are not ſuch as ſhall be *bleſſed at their death*, viz. ſuch as wilfully reject the apparent light that is offered unto them; for he that wilfully breaketh any one of the Commandments of God, is guilty of the breach of all, *Jam.*2.10,11. and *John* affirmeth, That he that ſaith he knoweth God, and keepeth not his Commandments, is a lyer, and the truth is not in him; and that whoſo keepeth them in him verily is the love of God perfected, *Joh.*3.3 4. compared with *Jam.*2.22,23. all which may be a ſufficient caution to thoſe who pretend themſelves to be Churches of Chriſt, and *divide the commandments of God*, from the *faith of Jeſus*, in point of *obedience*, and thereby denieth the authority of the holy Scriptures of the old Teſtament: whereas the Apoſtle *Paul* commendeth the *Bereans*, for ſearching into them to examine the truth of the doctrine of Jeſus, which he preached unto them, *Acts.* 17.11,12. yea, our Saviour preferreth *Moſes* and the Prophets, before the teaching of one that is riſen from the dead, *Luk.*16.29, 30,31. but to the point.

Again, it is a queſtion whether the Saints departed this life, who have kept the *Commandments of God*, and the *faith of Jeſus*, be yet in the perfection of that Reſt which is to be had in Chriſt: Seeing the Apoſtle ſaith, *that they without us ſhall not be made perfect*, Heb.11.39,40. which words muſt needs extend to the *general re-*

ſurre-

ſurrection, when body and ſoul ſhall be rejoyned, and ſo make their entrance therein: and if ſo, then the type is to be continued, during the whole kingdom of grace, and until the kingdom of glory makes its entrance.

Again by the ſame Argument that we may reject any of the commands of God upon the account of our faith in Jeſus, we may with the *Quakers* reject all.

And thus you ſee how the Champion is foyled, *at his own chief weapon*: ſo that unleſs his heart exceed his skill, we may expect he will quit the field, and never appear more gainſt the truth. But if this will not ſerve, I ſhall raiſe one or two Arguments more from his confeſſion, which I hope will do it, *viz. that one day in ſeven, is yet to be obſerved for a Sabbath*; which one day in ſeven, I affirm, can be no other then the ſeventh day intended by the Lawgiver in the fourth Precept.

For if *no day* can be Sabbath weekly, but the ſeventh day, then muſt the ſeventh day now be Sabbath day. But *no day* of ſeven can be ſabbath weekly, but the ſeventh day: therefore muſt the ſeventh day now be ſabbath day. The conſequence is clear of it ſelf, and needs no proof to the opponent, ſeeing he holds the morality of a ſabbath. The Minor is proved, in that without repeal or exception. God hath commanded, or at leaſt permitted and freely given us leave to labor and work, and do all that we have to do, *in theſe ſix days* which go *next* before the Sabbath or ſeventh day, *Exod.* 20. 9 10. which ſix days for labor, were never made Typical or Ceremonial, nor were ever ſhadows of Chriſt; yea, the firſt day of the week it ſelf was never excepted. If then we may work any of the ſix days, then are we not tyed to keep any of the ſix days, in reſting from work.

Again, if God muſt have one day in ſeven for a ſabbath, from the creation to the worlds end; then muſt he have *Saturday* the ſeventh day for a ſabbath, and not *Sunday* the firſt day of the week. But God muſt have one day in ſeven for a ſabbath (according to the opponents own confeſſion, until the worlds end) therefore he ought to have *Saturday* the ſeventh day for a ſabbath, and not *Sunday* the firſt day of the weak. The Minor is proved from the fourth Commandment, where it is expreſly ſaid, *The ſeventh day is the ſabbath*, viz. every ſeventh day from the creation, is the Sabbath. The Major I prove conſequently: for *Saturday* the ſeventh day, being the laſt day of the weak; if you omit it, and give God *Sunday* the firſt

day

day of the week; then it is plain, that God hath not a ſabbath in every week, or ſeven days; for he wanted a ſabbath in that week wherein the change was made, from *Saturday* to *Sunday*, which lack or want of a ſabbath that week, can no ways be ſupplied, but by returning back, to give God *Saturday* the ſeventh day again.

So that if God muſt have *one day* in every ſeven, you muſt give him *Saturday*, which is the laſt day of ſeven, without any change to the day after; or elſe you both deny that in practice, which the opponent holds in judgement, *viz.* that God muſt have one day in every ſeven; as alſo live in the breach of the fourth Commandment, which injoyneth every ſeventh day: neither will it ſerve your turn to ſay, this change was made by others many hundred years agone.

For ſo long as you uphold their day and change, you tread in their ſteps, and juſtifie their fact, and are acceſſary unto it; which I hope the Lord will deliver you from, by ſleighting the doctrine of ſuch perſons, who prefer humane conjectures before the expreſs command of God; and conſequently may as well teach you to obſerve any other of the Popiſh ſuperſtitious days, as *Sunday for the Sabbath.* For the grand reaſon they can urge for the change of the Sabbath from *Saturday* to *Sunday*, is, becauſe they imagine that Chriſt wrought our redemption on that day; as alſo in that they hold the work of the redemption, greater then the work of the creation.

To which I anſwer, It will admit of a controverſie, whether the work of Redemption is greater then the work of the Creation, either in extent or univerſality, or in regard of honourableneſs, either in reſpect to Man or Angels: but put the caſe it were granted, that redemption were the greater work, what warrant hath any therefrom, to change a Moral and perpetual Command of Jehovah the one Law-giver, to ſatisfie their own minds therein, as it ſeems ſome have done?

Again, unleſs ſuch perſons have a minde to extirpate the work of the creation out of their remembrance; why may they not as well commemorate the work of redemption on that day, which God himſelf hath appointed for the commemoration of the work of the creation, as to remember the work of the creation on the day of redemption, and that upon the account of a *humane tradition*; as alſo whenas the day is uncertain on which our redemption was wrought; as whether upon *Friday*, the day of Chriſts Paſſion; or upon *Sunday*, the day of his Reſurrection; or upon *Thurſday*, the day of his Aſcenſion; as alſo in that the perſons that have appointed

it

it on the *Sunday*, had no power ſo to do, as hath been ſhewed, and conſequently a vain tradition? *Mat.* 15. 8 9.

Again, ſeeing it is a doubtful matter, whether of the works are greater, as alſo the day doubtful on which the redemption was wrought; why ſhould ſuch a weight be laid upon that work, which ſtandeth not by a commandment, either from God or Chriſt, or his Apoſtles, as to eccliſpe or obliterate that work, which ſtandeth by a Moral and perpetual commandment, as the Sabbath in queſtion doth, in reference to the work of the creation?

And therefore in matters of this weight, as eſtabliſhing a Sabbath, men ought to bring in Arguments neceſſarily and demonſtratively proving, and not conjectures of their own fancies; eſpecially ſeeing the erecting of a new Sabbath, which hath no commandment from Chriſt or his Apoſtles, makes way for the throwing down of the old Sabbath, which ſtandeth by an expreſs command from God.

Poſt-ſcript.

READER, this may give thee to underſtand, that after Mr. Simpſon *had ended his Sermon, I called to him twice, but he would not anſwer, betaking himſelf to prayer; which when he had ended, I called unto him again and told him it was an eaſie thing for him to maintain an Argument, where none did oppoſe him: and withal, I told him that I was there ready to maintain that he had taught an erroneous doctrine: he anſwered, it was not a convenient time to enter upon the tryal of the doctrine he had then delivered, but ſaid he would do it at ſome other time. I then willed him to appoint a time and place, but he refuſed, unleſs he knew his Opponent to be a man able to diſpute like a Scholar; implying (as I judged) that I was not fit for ſuch a purpoſe: Whereupon I asked if he would give way for one to preach the contrary doctrine: But he and ſeveral of the Congregation refuſed ſo to do, ſaying, they would not give way to have the truth preached down. Wherepon, conceiving my ſelf ingaged one way or other to anſwer to what he had then delivered, I have therefore thought it the meeteſt way, to let his Auditors*

tore know what I had to say thereunto; to the end they may discern the fallacies and groſs abſurdities he then delivered. And this I have done not in the leaſt out of prejudice to the perſon of Mr. Simplon *(for ſo I ſhould be ungrateful, in reference to his kindneſs ſhewed me, when I was in bonds) but merely upon the account of the error which he proſecuteth, hoping the Lord will make it inſtrumental to cauſe him to confeſs and diſclaim what he hath ſpoken againſt the Lords holy Sabbath, and henceforth walk in obedience thereunto; as alſo induce others to do the like: Which the Lord in much mercy grant for his truth ſake, which is ſo much ſlighted by the profeſſors of this Generation and Nation, Amen.*

FINIS.

TRINITY COLLEGE LIBRARY CAMBRIDGE

London, Printed for the Author, of whom they may be had.

Errata, pag. 4. line 22. read *not his blood*, for *his not blood*, and p. 7. l. 22. *opponent*, for *apparent*.